



fact or to present newly discovered evidence.’’ *Max’s Seafood Café v. Quinteros*, 176 F.3d 669, 677 (3d Cir. 1999) (quoting *Harsco Corp. v. Zlotnicki*, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985)). A Court may grant a motion for reconsideration if the moving party shows: (1) an intervening change in the controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence which was not available when the court issued its order; or (3) the need to correct a clear error of law or fact or to prevent a manifest injustice. *Max’s Seafood Café by Lou Ann, Inc. v. Quinteros*, 176 F.3d 669, 677 (3d Cir. 1999) (citing *North River Ins. Co. v. Cigna Reinsurance Co.*, 52 F.3d 1194, 1218 (3d Cir. 1995)).

Plaintiff’s present submission consists of essentially an amended complaint setting forth many of the same allegations as those included in her initial Complaint, which was dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (Docket No. 3). On review, the allegations contained in Plaintiff’s “Complaint to reinstate and amend case no. 11-907” demonstrate to the Court that this case was appropriately dismissed. (*Id.*). As the Court recognized in its July 12, 2011 Order, a district court does not have jurisdiction to adjudicate a collateral attack on orders issued regarding separate civil actions. *See Gagliardi v. Standish*, 2011 WL 2410989, at \*1 (3d Cir. Jun. 16, 2011) (“A district court lacks “jurisdiction to adjudicate collateral challenges in the nature of appeals.”). To this end, it is plainly inappropriate to file a lawsuit against the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania in an effort to seek that those lawsuits be reopened.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, as this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over the present matter, this case was properly dismissed. *See Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(h)(3)* (“If the court determines at any time that it lacks subject-matter jurisdiction, the court must dismiss the action.”).

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court notes that Plaintiff filed motions for reconsideration in Civil Actions 11-568 and 11-881, which

For these reasons, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration [3] is denied.

*s/Nora Barry Fischer*  
Nora Barry Fischer  
United States District Judge

Date: August 2, 2011

cc: April Cherise Hamlin, *pro se*  
P.O. Box 334  
Pittsburgh, PA 15230-0334  
(regular and certified mail)

---

were denied. (Civ. A. No. 11-568, Docket No. 5; Civ. A. No. 11-881, Docket No. 5).